UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,302	07/26/2006	Ralf Wnuk	51540	6536
ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P. 1300 19TH STREET, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			ANDERSON, DENISE R	
SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/587,302	WNUK, RALF	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Denise R. Anderson	1797	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-25</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)
13. Other:
/Walter D. Griffin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/587,302

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant amended claims 16 and 24 to recite "a bar screen tube filter element." The term was cited for indefiniteness and the claims were examined in light of paragraph 28 in the Specification which disclosed "tubular wedge-wire screen filter elements." A secondary reference, Wnuk et al. (US 2003/0213127), was brought in to explicitly disclose the tubular wedge-wire screen filter elements. Applicant has amended the claims to recite a "tubular screen filter element." The new matters raised are (1) whether the Specification supports this move away from frustoconical filter elements and (2) whether the Wnuk et al. reference is required in the rejection.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the objection to the substitute Specification should be withdrawn because, "Nothing in the record supports the conclusionary allegation that 'automatic clutch' is a narrower term" than "free wheeling device." Applicant offers evidence that an automatic clutch is equivalent to a freewheeling clutch. The examiner responds by noting that the term "automatic clutch" is being substituted for "free wheeling device," not "freewheeling clutch." The examiner maintains that an "automatic clutch" is a narrower term relative to a "free wheeling device," and cites Bodenhorn (U.S. Patent No. 1,850,197, Mar. 22, 1932). Bodenhorn discloses an "Automobile Free Wheeling Device" in Fig. 1 and shows the automatic clutch, as part of the free wheeling device, in Fig. 6. Bodenhorn, Title; p. 1, lines 23-28 and 40-45. As such, the examiner maintains the objection to the Specification.

Regarding the new limitations, the arguments put forth have been considered but are not persuasive because they relate to an amendment that has not been entered. The remaining arguments put forth were previously addressed in the final rejection.